

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Sherbow.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: Based on the modern concept, based on the recommendation of the Sobeloff Commission, and Professor Schweitzer's studies, based on everything that is available on the subject of budget, we are not in any way eliminating the requirements of the details in the budget. We are, however, saying that in order that the public, the legislature, all be aware of what is encompassed within the budget, it shall be by program.

This has the broadest meaning. The intent of the Committee is not to be restrictive in any way. The two words should have the broadest interpretation in our judgment in order to shed enlightenment, in order to shed information, in order to give the legislature and the people a full and complete knowledge of everything that is contemplated in the field of expenditures that are requested by the governor.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Maurer.

DELEGATE MAURER: Judge Sherbow, does the addition of this change conform to the budget we have now?

DELEGATE SHERBOW: No, because it originally was meant to be changed by institution of the program budget, but I do not find from a practical point of view that there has been any real change that has been made. They still have the line by line book system. Here it is. You know, every detail is furnished. It does not help. It could help tremendously.

I know if I were sitting in the legislature I would much rather know what the programs are, what the total allotted for that program last year was, what you are asking for next year, rather than to know if they ordered two new automobiles and three new stenographers.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Maurer.

DELEGATE MAURER: I do not disagree with you on the value of a program budget, as I said initially, Judge Sherbow. I just wondered whether this is something we should constitutionalize or whether this is something which is moving along anyhow, and this is just unnecessary, and, in fact, may be restrictive in the future, 25 or 30 years from now.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: We do not think it is restrictive. We think it is helpful. We feel it ought to remain in. I think

the Eney draft as well reached that same conclusion.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): The Chair recognizes Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: Delegate Sherbow, I would like to refer you to section 6.05, on line 25 of the recommendation. The last word on that line is "he." Does that refer back to the governor, or does it refer back to the people who were to certify the estimates of the appropriations? Who is it that has the power of directing the time to perform?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Sherbow.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: That means the governor. He sets up the form, the standards and all the information. When we say the Governor, we mean the Director of the Budget under him is going to provide all the forms and details. He is going to tell them what kind of language he wants all of this to come under, because we hope out of it some day will come a uniform system.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: In section 6.06 when the governor sends an amendment to become part of the budget bill, suppose the budget bill has meanwhile passed one house. Does it mean it must go back to that house?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Sherbow.

DELEGATE SHERBOW: If it has passed one house, it would have to go back to that one house to be incorporated in as one budget unless, of course, he did not care that it be made a separate matter in which event you may have to provide separate taxes for it.

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: In section 6.07 we discussed that last sentence about the compensation of public officers. In the legislative branch article we provided that the legislature may not increase its salary except under certain specified circumstances.

Are we now saying that the legislature may not decrease its salary at all during its term?

DELEGATE J. CLARK (presiding): Delegate Sherbow.